

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:                   Callaway Plant Unit 2  
                              Draft EIS Public Meeting

Docket Number:     (n/a)

Location:             Fulton, Missouri

Date:                  Wednesday, February 18, 2009

Work Order No.:     NRC-2668

Pages 1-59

**NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.**  
**Court Reporters and Transcribers**  
**1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.**  
**Washington, D.C. 20005**  
**(202) 234-4433**

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4 PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING

5 PROCESS FOR PROPOSED CALLAWAY PLANT UNIT 2

6 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

7 \* \* \* \* \*

8 WEDNESDAY,

9 FEBRUARY 18, 2009

10 \* \* \* \* \*

11 FULTON, MISSOURI

12 \* \* \* \* \*

13 The Public Meeting convened at Westminster  
14 College, Champ Auditorium, 501 Westminster Avenue,  
15 Fulton, Missouri 65251 at 1:00 p.m.

16 Present on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory  
17 Commission:

18 Gregory Hachett

19 Chet Poslusny

20 Bruce Olson

21 Niles Chokshi

22

23

24

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome and Purpose of Meeting.....	3
By Chet Poslusny and Gregory Hatchett	
Overview of the Combined License Process.....	8
Overview of Environmental Review Process.....	11
Public Comments.....	20
Closing By Nilesh Chokshi.....	58

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

## P R O C E E D I N G S

(1:00 p.m.)

WELCOME/PURPOSE OF MEETING

MR. POSLUSNY: In the interest of starting on time, it looks like we have almost everybody in here. On behalf of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, I would like to welcome you all to this Environmental Scoping Meeting relative to the COL; (Combined License Application), for the Callaway Nuclear Plant Unit Two.

This is the first of two meetings that we will be holding today. The second one officially starts at 6:00 this evening with an open house starting about 5:00.

My name is Chet Poslusny. I'm going to be the facilitator/moderator for tonight's meeting; and it is my job to make sure that the meeting is productive for you, who have taken time out of your schedule, plus those NRC staff who are here as well. A couple of administrative items; if you need to use the restrooms, the entrances are in the back of the auditorium. You take the steps and go downstairs. If you could shut off your cell phones that would be great. I've done that to mine. We are scheduled for a three hour meeting today, and a three hour meeting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this evening, and we would like to try to keep to that  
2 schedule.

3 A little bit about ground rules. The  
4 meeting is being transcribed, and when you have the  
5 opportunity to speak if you have signed up, make sure  
6 you speak your name clearly for the record. The  
7 entire meeting will be recorded, transcribed, and you  
8 will be able to get copies of that information later  
9 on. We will talk about that soon. We expect some  
10 people are very interested in this project, and we  
11 will hear some very important comments this evening.  
12 Maybe some of you may not agree with some of them, but  
13 we would like to give everybody the opportunity to  
14 provide comments later on during the scoping session.

15 Every comment is a good comment and we need to hear  
16 them. I would like to have one speaker at a time, and  
17 that is a pretty basic rule.

18 Meeting structure: what are we going to  
19 do this afternoon and this evening? For the first  
20 part we are going to have the staff presenting  
21 information about our review processes, both the  
22 Safety and Environmental Review; and we will follow  
23 that with a short five or ten minute session for  
24 asking questions about what is the NRC doing, and how  
25 can you participate in the process.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           The second part is the most important part  
2 of this meeting is to gather scoping comments.  
3 Comments that will help the staff do a better job, a  
4 more detailed job, on its Environmental Review. You  
5 folks who live closest to the plant can help us with  
6 that type of information. We also hope that you may  
7 hear things tonight that you will think about, and  
8 maybe go home and send some additional comments to us  
9 because that is just as valuable. You can do that by  
10 mail or by electronic means. And all those comments  
11 are equally treated by the staff. So, please, if you  
12 don't feel like speaking tonight, if you want to send  
13 something in, please do that. It is just as  
14 important. Let's see.

15           Let me introduce our speakers for tonight.

16       Mr. Greg Hatchett is Chief of Environmental Projects  
17 Branch. Mr. Bruce Olson is the Environmental Project  
18 Manager. Our Senior Manager here today is Niles  
19 Chokshi. He is the Deputy Director for the Division  
20 of Site and Environmental Reviews. We also have  
21 representatives from other NRC Offices who may need to  
22 answer some questions during that period that I talked  
23 about. So, with that, let us begin our presentations;  
24 and thank you for your attention and for attending  
25 today. Greg.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. HATCHETT: Can everyone hear me okay?

2 At the risk of being somewhat redundant, let me thank  
3 you all again for taking time out of your busy  
4 schedule to come and participate in our NRC Staff's  
5 Scoping Meeting. We were here last year in early  
6 July, where we gave a brief overview of the NRC  
7 licensing process. If you were here back then, you  
8 heard us talk about both the Environmental Review and  
9 the Safety Review aspects of what the NRC does once an  
10 Applicant submits an application for a new nuclear  
11 power plant. Today we're going to provide another  
12 brief overview of both the Safety and Environmental  
13 Review. But more importantly, we are here to discuss  
14 with you the environmental scoping part of NRC review.

15 Ameren submitted its application back in late July,  
16 and the staff began its review process. That process  
17 completed itself in December, and we docketed the  
18 application.

19 Once that application is "docketed", the  
20 NRC staff begins what we call the detailed review  
21 analysis of the application put before the Commission  
22 to determine if Ameren has met the requirements to  
23 operate a new nuclear power plant. What is scoping?  
24 The scoping process is the process that the Commission  
25 uses to help it develop its Environmental Impact

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Statement. Bruce is going to get up here when I'm  
2 done and give you all the details of the Environmental  
3 Review Process. He's going to do all the heavy  
4 lifting. But again, it is mainly the process by which  
5 we come into the community and ask you all to tell us  
6 things that we may not know. We use that information  
7 in our Environmental Review to form the development of  
8 our Environmental Impact Statement. We can't do a  
9 good job at that without your help and assistance by  
10 providing that information about things that we could  
11 never know. We have the information provided to us by  
12 the Applicant, but you may know something that we  
13 don't know. This scoping process helps us discover  
14 those things that we don't know by reaching out to you  
15 and asking you to participate in the process.

16 We talk about the process of stake holders  
17 being involved in the NRC review process. This  
18 process, I believe, in any application that has been  
19 put before the Commission, works best when we have  
20 diverse and broad input from the stake holders to help  
21 inform the decision-making process that the Commission  
22 is going to undertake. So we are unable, I think,  
23 sometimes to do the most effective job without the  
24 stakeholder involvement. So stakeholder involvement  
25 is key to what we do; and so we take this information

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 and we really do appreciate it. So, with that, I'm  
2 going to sit down, and I'm going to let Mr. Olson tell  
3 you all about the Environmental Scoping Process and  
4 the Environmental Review.

5 OVERVIEW OF THE COMBINED LICENSE PROCESS

6 MR. OLSON: Thank you, Greg. And thank  
7 you all for coming here tonight -- this afternoon --  
8 and participating in this Scoping Meeting. My name is  
9 Bruce Olson and I'm the NRC Project Manager for the  
10 Environmental Review for the Callaway Plant Unit Two  
11 Combined License Application. I'll start my  
12 presentation by briefly discussing the statutes and  
13 regulations that apply to the NRC's review of Combined  
14 License Applications and in particular the  
15 Environmental Review.

16 In general, the NRC regulates civilian use  
17 of nuclear materials to protect the public health and  
18 safety and the environment. The NRC is not a  
19 proponent of nuclear power, but a licensing and  
20 regulatory agency. The NRC's regulatory and licensing  
21 functions, including those for new nuclear reactors,  
22 were established under the Atomic Energy Act. The  
23 National Environmental Policy Act, which I will  
24 sometimes refer to as NEPA during this presentation,  
25 established national environmental policy for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 protection, maintenance and enhancement of the  
2 environment, and provides a means for federal agencies  
3 to carry out that goal. For NRC's licensing of new  
4 reactors, this is done through the development of an  
5 Environmental Impact Statement or EIS. The NRC  
6 implements NEPA in a manner consistent with our  
7 licensing and regulatory functions; the requirements  
8 and procedures which are specified in the NRC's  
9 records regulations and included in the Title 10 of  
10 the Code of Federal Regulations Part 51. In addition,  
11 10 CFR Part 52, governs the issuance of Combined  
12 Licenses.

13 The NRC's Environmental Review also  
14 includes compliance with other statutes such as the  
15 National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered  
16 Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and  
17 many other state, federal and local environmental laws  
18 and regulations.

19 The Applicant, AmerenUE, is seeking a  
20 Combined License for a new reactor at the Callaway  
21 Plant Unit Two at the existing Callaway site.  
22 Issuance of a Combined License is an NRC decision that  
23 authorizes an Applicant to construct and operate a  
24 nuclear power plant at a specific site in accordance  
25 with applicable Federal Statutes and Regulations. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Callaway Plant Unit Two Combined License, if issued by  
2 the NRC would allow for the construction and operation  
3 of this plant with conditions. Ameren submitted its  
4 Combined License Application on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2008 for an  
5 AREVA EPR nuclear reactor. This application includes  
6 an Environmental Report which is now under review by  
7 the NRC as part of the licensing process.

8 NRC regulations allow Combined License  
9 Applications to reference designs that are docketed  
10 and under review by the NRC, but are not yet  
11 certified. The AREVA U.S. EPR design, referenced by  
12 Ameren for use at the Callaway site has not yet been  
13 certified, but is currently under review by NRC staff.

14 The review is scheduled to be completed by May, 2011.

15 This design, if acceptable, would be certified by  
16 rulemaking. In addition, as part of its Callaway  
17 Plant two combined license application review, the NRC  
18 staff is conducting both a Site-Specific Safety Review  
19 of the EPR design in relation to its proposed location  
20 at the Callaway site, and an Environmental Review and  
21 analysis of the potential impacts of constructing and  
22 operating the proposed Callaway Plant Two facility at  
23 the Callaway site. The Combined License Application  
24 review process begins when an application has been  
25 accepted and docketed by the NRC and Don is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 highlighting that. The Safety and Environmental  
2 Review I discussed earlier are then started and  
3 conducted in parallel. The Safety Review follows the  
4 top path shown on this slide. The Environmental  
5 Review follows the bottom path. The Safety Review  
6 focuses on the public health and safety in relation to  
7 a proposed facility and ends with issuance of a final  
8 Safety Evaluation Report.

9 OVERVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

10 MR. OLSON: The Environmental Review  
11 focuses on the proposed plant potential construction  
12 and operation impact on the environment, and ends with  
13 issuance of a final Environmental Impact Statement, or  
14 EIS. Both of these reviews feed into the NRC's  
15 hearing process, which is the middle path shown on  
16 this slide. The hearing process factors in the  
17 results of both reviews and leads to the final step of  
18 the license application review process, the  
19 Commission's decision on whether or not to grant the  
20 license.

21 As mentioned earlier, the NRC's  
22 Environmental Review is guided by the National  
23 Environmental Policy Act, also known as NEPA. NEPA  
24 requires federal agencies to use a systematic approach  
25 to consider environmental impacts associated with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 major federal actions that have the potential to  
2 significantly affect the human environment. This  
3 approach involves input from the public, and requires  
4 development of the Environmental Impact Statement.  
5 The NRC has determined the issuance of a Combined  
6 License for a nuclear reactor facility to be a major  
7 federal action. As such, the staff will be developing  
8 an Environmental Impact Statement before the  
9 Commission takes final action on Ameren's application.

10 As part of the NRC's Environmental Review  
11 the staff will evaluate the potential environmental  
12 impacts of construction and operation of a new EPR  
13 facility at the Callaway site. NRC's regulations for  
14 implementing NEPA are Title 10 of the Code of Federal  
15 Regulations Part 51. In addition, the NRC's  
16 Environmental Standard Review Plan, NUREG 1555, and  
17 other documents provide guidance to the NRC staff on  
18 how to conduct an Environmental Review and how to  
19 document our findings in the Environmental Impact  
20 Statement. These regulations and guidance documents  
21 can be found on NCR's web site, which I will discuss  
22 later. The NRC's Environmental Review provides  
23 opportunities for public involvement. The first  
24 opportunity is the scoping period, which is why we are  
25 here today. After our environmental findings are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 clearly documented in the draft Environmental Impact  
2 Statement for the Callaway Plant Two Project, the  
3 public will have the opportunity the comment on the  
4 draft EIS. Throughout the entire review, the NRC  
5 staff will maintain an open and transparent review  
6 process.

7 When a Combined License Application is  
8 received the NRC staff first review it to ensure it  
9 meets our completeness and technical sufficiency  
10 guidance. If acceptable, the application is docketed  
11 and we proceed with both our Environmental and Safety  
12 Reviews. The three white ovals on this slide identify  
13 periods at which the public has the opportunity to  
14 participate in the review process. To start the  
15 Environmental Review the NRC publishes a Notice of  
16 Intent in the Federal Register. This notice informs  
17 the public of our intention to prepare an  
18 Environmental Impact Statement and conduct the scoping  
19 process. The scoping process includes a public  
20 comment period. This public meeting is part of that  
21 process. We will collect your comments today and  
22 document them in the meeting transcript. The public  
23 can then also provide written comments through the end  
24 of the scoping period. After the end of the scoping  
25 period, the Scoping Summary Report is prepared.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Additional information for preparing the EIS is  
2 gathered during the site audit, and other data  
3 collection activities. At the site audit the  
4 Applicant and the NRC staff visit the project site and  
5 vicinity, and meet with the Applicant's  
6 representatives to begin the NRC's independent  
7 evaluation of the information provided in the  
8 Applicant's Environmental Report. After analyzing all  
9 the information gathered, we develop a draft EIS and  
10 issue it for public comment. At that time we hold  
11 another public meeting, such as this one, to present  
12 the results of our review and write your comments on  
13 the draft EIS. After evaluating your comments, the  
14 NRC staff will decide to modify the draft EIS which  
15 results in our issuance of the final EIS. The final  
16 EIS and the results of the Safety Review are used as  
17 inputs to the NRC hearing process; the final result of  
18 which is the decision by the Commission on the  
19 application.

20 You are the ones who are most familiar  
21 with this community. The NRC staff has come here  
22 today so that you can share with us those  
23 environmental issues and values that you believe are  
24 important to your community. We will consider this  
25 information preparing the Callaway Plant Unit Two EIS,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Environmental Impact Statement. In addition to  
2 providing comments and information here today, you  
3 have the opportunity to continue to share your  
4 comments or provide additional information to us  
5 through March 24, 2009, as I will discuss later. We  
6 will include all comments received in our Scoping  
7 Summary Report which we expect to be available in the  
8 NRC web site in July, 2009 timeframe. Comments  
9 applicable to the Environmental Review will be  
10 considered in the NRC staff's development of the draft  
11 EIS.

12 Many different sources of information will  
13 be used by the NRC to develop the EIS for the Callaway  
14 Plant Unit Two Project. This EIS will be an  
15 independent evaluation of the affect of the proposed  
16 plan on the environment in the local community. So  
17 although the staff starts with the Applicant's  
18 Environmental Report in the Combined License  
19 Application, we investigate other possible sources of  
20 information. This Scoping Meeting represents one  
21 point at which the NRC staff will gather comments and  
22 information from the public. We will also conduct the  
23 site audit discussed earlier and will communicate with  
24 federal, tribal, state and local agencies to gather  
25 information and insights.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1                   As       shown       on       this       slide,       a  
2       multidisciplinary team of NRC staff with backgrounds  
3       in a variety of relevant scientific and technical  
4       disciplines has been assembled to conduct the Callaway  
5       Plant Unit Two Environmental Review. In addition, the  
6       NRC has contracts with the Pacific Northwest National  
7       Laboratory and Numark Associates to assist us in  
8       preparing the EIS. The NRC and contractor staff have  
9       expertise on a wide range of topics related to  
10      environmental issues and nuclear power.

11                   Now the schedule. The NRC's review of the  
12      Environmental Report is now underway. And the Notice  
13      of Intent preparing the EIS and conduct scoping was  
14      published on January 23, 2009. Again, you can provide  
15      your oral and written comments for the scoping process  
16      today, and your written comments through March 24<sup>th</sup>,  
17      2009. We have copies of the Federal Register Notice  
18      of Intent here on our registration table at the  
19      auditorium entries. The Notice describes how you the  
20      public can submit your scoping comments. The NRC  
21      staff expects to complete the draft EIS in 2010 at  
22      which time it will be made available for seventy-five  
23      days for public comment. During that time, we will  
24      have another public meeting to share the results of  
25      our Environmental Review and to receive your comments

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 on the draft EIS. Your comments will be evaluated and  
2 addressed for the final EIS, which the Agency expects  
3 to issue their final EIS in 2011, two thousand eleven.

4 The NRC schedule for the Callaway Plant Combined  
5 License Application review has not yet been finalized  
6 in detail, so the milestone dates given here are  
7 estimated. The NRC web site, [www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov) and the  
8 project specific Callaway web page will provide that  
9 information when it becomes available.

10 As I discussed earlier, during the  
11 Environmental Review Process, the public has  
12 opportunities to comment during the scoping period and  
13 on the draft EIS. Public meetings such as this one  
14 today are held at each of these points in the project.

15 The public will also have access to the Environmental  
16 Review results in the form of the draft and final EIS  
17 on NRC's web site and at other locations. Another  
18 opportunity for public involvement is the NRC's formal  
19 hearing process which covers both environmental and  
20 safety issues. This process includes a mandatory  
21 hearing before the Commission, and if necessary, one  
22 or more contested hearings before the Atomic Safety  
23 and Licensing Board. As will be discussed in more  
24 detail on the next slide, interested persons can  
25 Petition to Intervene in that process. The deadline

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to file to intervene is April the 6<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Once the  
2 NRC publishes its notice of opportunity to participate  
3 in the hearing, the public has sixty days to file a  
4 Petition to Intervene. This notice was published in  
5 the Federal Register on February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2009; so the  
6 deadline would be Sunday, April 5<sup>th</sup>. Where the  
7 computed day is Sunday the period runs until the end  
8 of the next day by regulation. Anyone who wishes to  
9 file a Petition to Intervene should give the hearing  
10 notice close attention, and should review Title 10 of  
11 the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 2.309. Both  
12 provide important information related to intervention  
13 petitions. To file a Petition to Intervene you must  
14 obtain a digital Certificate of Approval from the NRC  
15 in advance or seek a waiver from the digital  
16 certificate requirement. Information regarding this  
17 process is provided in the hearing notice and on the  
18 web site shown in this slide. It is important not to  
19 wait until the last week of the notice period because  
20 it may take up to ten business days to receive the  
21 digital certificate. We have here today at our  
22 registration table copies of the February 4<sup>th</sup> hearing  
23 notice and information on the E-filing web site. Help  
24 is also available by phone at the phone number given.

25 Here are the NRC's points of contact for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the Callaway Plant Unit Two Combined License  
2 Application. In addition to myself, I have provided  
3 the phone number of Mr. Surinder Arora, who is our  
4 Lead Safety Project Manager and is here with us today.

5 The Callaway Plant Unit Two Application can be viewed  
6 on the internet in our electronic reading room linked  
7 to the NRC's web site which is [www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov). In  
8 addition, the NRC recently established a telephone and  
9 email help desk to assist interested parties in  
10 accessing documents through the Agency's electronic  
11 filing system. The help desk can be reached toll free  
12 at the number above, 1-800-397-4209; or by email at  
13 [PDR.resource@NRC.gov](mailto:PDR.resource@NRC.gov). The Callaway Unit Two  
14 Environmental Report is available now in hard copy and  
15 digital format at the Callaway County Library in  
16 Fulton and at the Ellis Library at the University of  
17 Missouri in Columbia. The draft and final EIS reports  
18 will also be available there in the future. If you  
19 want to be on our mailing list, please make sure your  
20 name and address is provided to one of the NRC staff  
21 at our registration table. They can provide you with  
22 a card for that purpose. This is one way of ensuring  
23 that you will be notified of upcoming meetings and  
24 that you will receive copies of the draft and the  
25 final EIS itself.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           So in summary, your scoping comments  
2 regarding the NRC's Callaway Plant Unit Two  
3 Environmental Review can be provided to us today at  
4 this meeting. Your comments can also be sent to us by  
5 mail or email. Details are provided on this slide.  
6 And that is included in the copy of the slide  
7 presentation and the Federal Register Notice of Intent  
8 that you can obtain at our registration table. That  
9 concludes our formal slide presentation. Thank you  
10 very much for participating in this scoping meeting.

11           MR. POSLOSNY: Thank you, Greg and Bruce.

12       The staff -- we told you about the process that is  
13 going on and the Environmental Review of the potential  
14 impacts of the construction and operation of this new  
15 Callaway Unit Two Plant. I would like to see if there  
16 are any questions on our process; how we're doing it,  
17 what we're doing, or how you can participate. We'll  
18 take about five minutes or so to deal with those  
19 questions. So if you would like to raise your hand,  
20 I'll bring the mike over to you and we'll take those  
21 questions.

22                           (No Verbal Response)

23       PUBLIC COMMENT

24           MR. POSLUSNY: Okay. With that, I see no  
25 hands. Then I would like to start the second part of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the meeting.

2 The way we did this is we put out or  
3 meeting notice and asked folks if they did want to  
4 comment and provide input to the scoping process if  
5 they could sign up either ahead of the meeting or  
6 today before the meeting. And that has been done. So  
7 what I propose to do is that I am going to read their  
8 names and ask that you either come down here to this  
9 podium or that one, or I'll share this mike if you  
10 don't feel like walking down. I'll ask you to state  
11 your name and provide your comment. I would like you  
12 to keep your comments to three to five minutes if you  
13 can. I'll remind you that if you have more to tell  
14 us, please give it to us in writing, or come back this  
15 evening and you can talk to us again and sign up  
16 again. So that's another option. So let me begin  
17 with Nancy Lewis please. Thanks, Nancy.

18 NANCY LEWIS: Thank you. I'm Nancy  
19 Lewis. I'm representing the Kingdom of Callaway  
20 Chamber of Commerce. We understand that the economy  
21 and the quality of life are definite parts of this,  
22 and I have a letter to read on behalf of the Chamber  
23 Board.

24 "The Kingdom of Callaway Chamber of  
25 Commerce Board of Directors representing the Chamber

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 membership would like to express our strong commitment  
2 to the Callaway Plant Second Unit. The economic  
3 benefit to our community is very difficult to  
4 calculate. We are well aware that all businesses in  
5 Callaway County profit from the Callaway Plant. Our  
6 County has continued to be one of the fastest growing  
7 counties in mid Missouri. Much of that growth can be  
8 attributed to the stable economy and workforce of  
9 which Ameren is a part.

10 We would also like to state that the  
11 employees and families are also a vital part of our  
12 community. The human resources that have come into  
13 the County and been developed from within are a  
14 positive addition to our quality of life. The  
15 volunteer hours and community support are a piece of  
16 the fabric of the community. As the Chamber of  
17 Commerce representing the business community, we add  
18 our combined voice to the overwhelming support from  
19 Callaway County. We would also like to again state  
20 our support in terms of the office. We have continued  
21 to help anyone that has called from the NRC, and would  
22 certainly continue to do that and the Callaway Plant  
23 for whatever support we can provide."

24 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Put that on  
25 the record. Thank you. The next person is Randy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thoenen. If I pronounced it wrong, I'm sorry. T-H-O-  
2 E-N-E-N.

3 ELAINE FARBER: I'm here for him.

4 MR. POSLUSNY: You are third on the list.  
5 Okay. Okay, I got you. Okay, fine.

6 ELAINE FABER: Hello, my name is Elaine  
7 Faber. I'm an Alderman for the City of Chamois, and  
8 Randy couldn't be with us today. I'm representing  
9 Chamois in northern Osage County across the Missouri  
10 River from the present Callaway County Nuclear Plant,  
11 and the proposed Callaway Two Project. Since 1984  
12 northern Osage County has been located within ten  
13 miles of the evacuation zone; and a portion of our own  
14 city is inside the five mile zone. For twenty-five  
15 years we have lived in the shadow of your plant and  
16 inherited the risk of danger from your plant with no  
17 economic benefit. Being south of the Missouri River  
18 with no highway access except crossing at Jefferson  
19 City or Conway, Missouri has limited the number of  
20 individuals who may wish to work at your power plant  
21 having to drive the fifty to sixty miles from Chamois  
22 to the plant. I read in your brochure distributed,  
23 annual construction jobs nearly three thousand on the  
24 average, and twelve-hundred-thirty sustained jobs with  
25 both reactors. We ask as the Chamois community not to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 forget us across the river. We have what we feel are  
2 the resources and talents that would be good for your  
3 project, just all we need is to bridge the gap between  
4 north and south of the river. As you asked for our  
5 support with your project, we ask for your support for  
6 economic success in our area as well, an area  
7 suffering now in its location and access to major  
8 highways. We also have a community grass roots effort  
9 called Project Share. I'll just read a little part of  
10 what they have been doing.

11 "The Project Share Group has been focused  
12 since it started on identifying business opportunities  
13 where Chamois County and its resources can add value  
14 to the efforts of AmerenUE in the proposed  
15 construction of Callaway Two Nuclear Reactor. We have  
16 been meeting with the legislators and representatives  
17 and MODOT officials and interested industries who will  
18 play a part in the construction of the facility to  
19 show how our collective community in Osage County  
20 could be a part of the proposed construction project  
21 and benefit from the economic development that will be  
22 created. We were pleased to read comments from the  
23 incoming Speaker of the House, Ron Richard,  
24 Republican, from Joplin.

25 Richard said the Callaway Two Project is a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 huge economic development opportunity that could  
2 include a new Missouri bridge at Chamois and eventual  
3 expansion into Callaway Three and Callaway Four  
4 nuclear plants. Clearly our efforts to bring  
5 attention to our quest for economic development has  
6 gotten the attention of visionaries like Ron Richard;  
7 and his forward-looking view of the economic impact  
8 having access across the Missouri River at Chamois  
9 would bring to all of mid Missouri. In conclusion, I  
10 would like to thank you, the representatives from  
11 Ameren, for presenting their plans for the Callaway  
12 expansion. Just remember, we feel that you have  
13 created more hazard for us living in its shadow just  
14 five miles away, and we are the largest populated town  
15 closest to the plant and offering nothing economically  
16 to our area on the southern bank of the Missouri  
17 River. We assume all the risk, but get none of the  
18 benefits. We ask that you bridge the gap and help  
19 your resources flow southward in our town as well."

20 Thank you.

21 MR. POSLUSNY: Thank you. Next is  
22 Genevieve Lamboley followed by Jonathan Murphy.

23 GENEVIEVE LAMBOLEY: Hello. My name is  
24 Genevieve Lamboley and I speak today on behalf of the  
25 Clean and Safe Energy Coalition, CASE Energy; and as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 someone who grew up here in Missouri. CASE Energy is  
2 a national grass roots organization of more than  
3 eighteen hundred individuals and organizations who  
4 come together in support of nuclear power as a vital  
5 part of our country's energy portfolio. According to  
6 the U.S. Department of Energy, our electricity demand  
7 will increase twenty-one percent by 2030. Here in  
8 Missouri nuclear power provides ten percent of the  
9 State's energy needs, and eighty-five percent of the  
10 clean energy in the state. Consequently, an  
11 additional new reactor at the Callaway site would only  
12 improve the state's air quality by reducing emissions  
13 of greenhouse gases. Missouri has experienced an  
14 average growth of one percent per year over the past  
15 five years. To keep Missouri's economy growing, the  
16 state will need new sources of power; power that is  
17 good for the environment and the economy. Nuclear  
18 energy is clean. The environmental impact at plants  
19 is far lower than many other types of power generating  
20 plants. Nuclear energy is safe. In fact, the U.S.  
21 Bureau of Labor Statistics has shown that it is safer  
22 to work at a nuclear power plant than in the  
23 manufacturing sector and even the real estate and  
24 financial industries. In addition, a nuclear plant  
25 makes a good neighbor. It supports high-paying jobs

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 directly at the plant and generates additional jobs in  
2 the community where it is located and contributes by  
3 helping to build good schools and roads. As our CASE  
4 Energy Job Report points out, which you can access on  
5 our web site, CleanSafeEnergy.org. If U.S. Utilities  
6 complete the twenty-six reactors currently under  
7 consideration we would add twelve thousand to twenty-  
8 one thousand new jobs, clean jobs, to the market. In  
9 the past few years alone, the nuclear energy industry  
10 has created fifteen thousand new jobs and added more  
11 than four billion dollars to the economy to prepare  
12 for building new state-of-the-art reactors. In these  
13 economic times there is no stronger argument to  
14 support the expansion of nuclear power. Thank you.

15 MR. POSLUSNY: After Jonathan Murphy will  
16 be Mike Downing.

17 JONATHAN MURPHY: Good afternoon. My  
18 name is Jonathan Murphy and I speak today on behalf of  
19 the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition otherwise known as  
20 CASE. We support the construction of new reactors  
21 like the proposed second unit here at Callaway, and  
22 are actively engaged in generating a public dialogue  
23 to educate others of the economic and environmental  
24 benefits of new nuclear power plants. We all know  
25 that our nation relies heavily on electricity. To

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 repeat Genny's point, the U.S. Department of Energy  
2 estimates that our electric demand will increase  
3 twenty-one percent by 2030. Technological advances  
4 have increased our reliance on the many gadgets that  
5 power our lives more efficiently and will increase the  
6 need for more clean sources of power. Nuclear energy  
7 is clean. It is the only large-scale, emissions-free  
8 source of electricity that we can readily expand to  
9 meet our growing energy demand. It already accounts  
10 for more than seventy percent of all clean energy  
11 produced in the United States which supplies twenty  
12 percent of all U.S. power. The reality is that it  
13 will require more power from a variety of sources in  
14 the years ahead. A wise energy policy recognizes the  
15 virtue of diversity. And in that diverse plan nuclear  
16 energy is a critical component. We all have a shared  
17 stake in American energy future. Now is the time for  
18 our country to support nuclear energy as a means to  
19 generate electricity with a clean, safe and dependable  
20 source of power. Thank you.

21 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Mike Downing.

22 MIKE DOWNING: Thank you for the  
23 opportunity to speak on behalf of this project. I'm  
24 Mike Downing, Executive Director of the Missouri Core  
25 Partnership. We are a non-profit, regional economic

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 development organization for twelve counties in the  
2 central Missouri area. I also represent another non-  
3 profit organization, Missouri Economic Development  
4 Council which is an association for professional  
5 economic developers in the State of Missouri; and also  
6 a co-chair of Missourians for a Balance of Energy  
7 Future. As you all can imagine in these uncertain  
8 economic times, we need this kind of project. A lot  
9 of people say, well this construction is not going to  
10 start for three or four years, how can it affect us.  
11 Once this project is announced, it will create  
12 opportunities for people in this area for housing, for  
13 retail, and other projects to prepare for this  
14 project. So it will have a relatively sooner economic  
15 impact, so we have to keep that in mind. Well, what  
16 is the impact of this project? Development Strategies  
17 Planning Firm out of St. Louis, a professional  
18 planning firm is employed to look at the economic  
19 impact of this project. They have indicated that  
20 during construction it will have twenty-nine hundred  
21 and sixty average annual construction jobs with a  
22 thirty-nine hundred and fifty at peak with an average  
23 annual expenditure during that ten year construction  
24 period of five hundred and four million dollars. The  
25 average annual economic output in Missouri during

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 construction is 1.2 billion dollars. The average  
2 annual jobs with the direct jobs from construction and  
3 all the spin-off it will create is eleven thousand  
4 seven hundred and eighty jobs. Upon completion of the  
5 project, Development Strategies has indicated that the  
6 direct number of jobs with the plant, the new jobs,  
7 will be four hundred to five hundred of the total  
8 number of jobs with the existing employees of about  
9 twelve hundred and thirty with the average annual  
10 economic output of six hundred and sixteen million  
11 dollars earlier with the average annual household  
12 earnings increased because of the project two hundred  
13 and twenty three million dollars. So this project  
14 will definitely have the significant economic impact  
15 to our area and I urge completion. Thank you very  
16 much.

17 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Let's continue  
18 with Mark Haim and then followed by Jesse Von Gerven.

19 MARK HAIM: Good afternoon. Good to be  
20 here with you all. My name is Mark Haim. I'm with  
21 Missourians for Safe Energy out of Columbia. I would  
22 like to start by asking -- if I can see a show of  
23 hands who here is for this plant being built? I'm not  
24 going to hold my hand up because I'm not. I think  
25 most of you are; and I would like to just request in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the interest of what we are supposed to be here to do  
2 today which is to scope out environmental issues. The  
3 people trying to address their comments to  
4 environmental concerns and that will help the NRC in  
5 developing the scope of this Environmental Impact  
6 Statement. I know there are lots of people who favor  
7 this plant, in particular people who have the dollar  
8 signs in their eyes and see money. And I respect  
9 that, you know. We all need money. We all need jobs.

10 I'm somebody who believes we should match our  
11 intention of getting good income with our intention of  
12 doing what is best for our future. I'm going to  
13 address a few of those things right now relatively  
14 briefly. One of the unique features of nuclear power  
15 plants is they not only produce prodigious waste  
16 streams, but the plants themselves become radioactive  
17 over their operational lives. Hence, every plant must  
18 ultimately be dismantled and component parts must be  
19 transported, isolated from the environment and stored  
20 for thousands of years as very dangerous waste. This  
21 decommissioning process is one of the big unknowns in  
22 terms of the environmental impact of building and  
23 operating nuclear power plants including the proposed  
24 Callaway Unit Two. It is of course imperative that we  
25 have a highly reliable assurance the decommissioning

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 would be done, but trusted assurances are very hard to  
2 come by. While in theory, funds are being set aside  
3 by reactor operators to pay for decommissioning, how  
4 can we be certain these funds will be actually  
5 available when the time comes to decommission. We  
6 think economic events may make this very painfully  
7 obvious situation as we know a number of plants around  
8 the country have had their decommissioning reserve  
9 funds significantly decrease in recent months. I ask  
10 you to consider for a moment the greater uncertainties  
11 exist regarding the state of our economy today. We  
12 really don't know, have no means of knowing, what the  
13 long run impact of the current economic meltdown will  
14 be. We don't know which corporations will survive the  
15 next six months or two years. We don't know what the  
16 value of the U.S. dollar will be in the near future,  
17 or what the state of our banks and financial  
18 institutions will be. Some posit it will be fairly  
19 quick and fairly complete recovery. Others equally  
20 credible voices posit much gloomier scenarios. That's  
21 in the next few years. How can you possibly project  
22 the state of the economy eighty or a hundred years  
23 from now? Will there be a vital market economy with  
24 resources and energy capable of commanding the labor  
25 of willing workers and providing the wherewithal to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 embark on and complete a project as daunting as  
2 disassembling and transporting hundreds of tons of  
3 massive metal castings, pipes, valves, electronics,  
4 wires, filters, concrete, etc. Will there be a  
5 transport sector even capable of moving as many tons  
6 of radioactive materials to a waste disposal site?  
7 Will there be such a site capable of handling these  
8 materials and safely isolating them for the tens of  
9 thousands of years required? Even if it is feasible  
10 for our descendants to accomplish these tasks, how can  
11 we be sure they would choose to devote their labor and  
12 resources to do so? The nuclear industry has for  
13 years been long on assurances and short on delivery.  
14 In 1980 I was one of the coordinators of the statewide  
15 Missouri Ballot Initiative that would have required a  
16 license for high level waste repositories a  
17 precondition to operating a nuclear power plant in our  
18 state. I worked with hundreds of volunteers to put  
19 this issue on the ballot. At that time Union  
20 Electric, Ameren's predecessor, responded by assuring  
21 voters that a waste repository was just over the  
22 horizon. I believe at that time they told us 1986 was  
23 the date we could be confident of having such a  
24 facility. Today we find ourselves twenty-eight years  
25 later, twenty-eight years down the road, and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 promised repository is even further off than it was in  
2 1980. Like a desert mirage that hovers over the  
3 horizon, but yet to materialize. This makes other  
4 promises including the promise to see that the plant  
5 would be decommissioned, hard for me to put my faith  
6 in. Just yesterday, February 17, 2009, I attended a  
7 hearing in our state capitol in which AmerenUE's CEO,  
8 Thomas Voss, spoke. He was asked by our legislature -  
9 - legislator about waste coming from the Callaway  
10 Plant and he assured the House Utilities Committee  
11 that there was no problem. He described the plant  
12 facilities for on-sight storage of the waste and then  
13 said, and I'm quoting, "Ameren could store this waste  
14 onsite for one hundred years. I don't think that's a  
15 problem either."

16 That is a direct verbatim quote from Mr.  
17 Voss. The problem is that neither Tom Voss nor I, or  
18 anyone in this room will be around in 2122, one  
19 hundred years from the date when the first waste from  
20 the proposed Callaway Two reactor will be pulled out  
21 of the reactor core. We don't know if folks who are  
22 around then would be inclined to or capable of dealing  
23 with the waste; and likewise, we don't know if they  
24 would move forward with the promised decommissioning  
25 process. We might have Thomas Voss's assurances. We

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 might have the NRC's assurances. But the bottom line  
2 question is, who can really assure us with any  
3 certainty regarding actions to be taken a century from  
4 now? It is an unacceptable degree of hubris involved  
5 for anyone to make such assurances. I'm sure the  
6 Romans in the fourth century received a no brainer  
7 that the aqueducts would be operating a century hence.

8 These massive waterworks were built and maintained  
9 for centuries. Who but a fool would think that coming  
10 generations will not continue to operate this critical  
11 infrastructure? One of the reasons for my concern is  
12 the continuity of economic institutions including  
13 corporations like AmerenUE, and in fact, the  
14 continuity of underlying social and political  
15 institutions that form and govern our society are  
16 often taken for granted. History has repeatedly  
17 shown, however, that we cannot assume such continuity.

18 The consequences of shutting down the aqueducts is  
19 quite serious, as an absence of water can make an area  
20 uninhabitable for human populations. The consequences  
21 of not dealing with radioactive waste, on the other  
22 hand, or decommissioning a radioactive mothball  
23 reactor, can be far more serious and even  
24 catastrophic. Please in considering the potential  
25 environmental impacts of building and operating the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 proposed Callaway Two, take a long and hard look at  
2 the issue of how we can be assured that after its  
3 useful life, the plant will be decommissioned and  
4 dealt with in a fashion that will prevent radioactive  
5 contamination of the air and water. Please explore  
6 what the impact might be if failure to do this,  
7 including the impact on humans and other animals, on  
8 plants and the biosphere in general. And consider too  
9 the possible radioactive contamination of workers and  
10 environment during the decommissioning process. Thank  
11 you very much.

12 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Okay. Jesse Von  
13 Gervan.

14 JESSE VAN GERVAN: This will be shorter,  
15 I promise. My name is Jesse Van Gervan. I am also a  
16 member of Missourians for Safe Energy. I am here to  
17 voice my concerns over the dangers associated with the  
18 nuclear waste that we produce by a second nuclear  
19 reactor in Callaway County. Spent nuclear fuel is  
20 much more radioactive than is the original reactor  
21 uranium fuel because of the production of fission  
22 products and transuranic elements in the power  
23 reactor. Particularly troublesome transuranic  
24 elements present in spent fuel are neptunium 237 with  
25 a half life of over two million years and plutonium

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 239 with a half life of a relatively short twenty-four  
2 thousand years. One year after discharged from a  
3 reactor, the dose rate measured one meter from a fuel  
4 assembly is one million milliseverts per hour. A  
5 person exposed to this radioactivity from one meter  
6 away would absorb a lethal dose in less than one  
7 minute. For comparison, the average person with the  
8 average exposure from natural background radioactivity  
9 is around three milliseverts per year. As of 2001,  
10 the United States had roughly forty five thousand  
11 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel from commercial  
12 nuclear reactors. And this number has surely grown  
13 larger. At the present time, our nation does not have  
14 a viable program for the permanent disposal of the  
15 very dangerous, high level nuclear waste that would be  
16 generated by this new reactor. On one end, the waste  
17 from the already operational reactor at Ameren's  
18 facility is currently being stored onsite in temporary  
19 storage facilities. These temporary facilities were  
20 never intended, nor designed, to hold this extremely  
21 hazardous waste for long periods of time. A 2005  
22 report issued by the National Academy of Sciences on  
23 the security of spent fuel pools at nuclear power  
24 reactors found that fuel in many pool designs may be  
25 vulnerable to terrorist attack. At worst, causing a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 zirconium clad fire that can release large amounts of  
2 radioactivity. In addition, the continued creation of  
3 radionuclides such as plutonium 239 and plutonium 240  
4 and uranium 233 at the new reactor will continue to  
5 exacerbate the nuclear weapon proliferation concerns  
6 associated with nuclear power. On the other hand,  
7 efforts to move forward with a national, commercial,  
8 high level nuclear waste depository at Yucca Mountain,  
9 Nevada was stymied in 2004 when the Federal DC Court  
10 of Appeals rejected the EPA's ten thousand year  
11 compliance period for the repository's performance  
12 assessment, as being clearly not consistent with the  
13 National Academy of Sciences recommendations. Nuclear  
14 energy is neither renewable nor clean despite  
15 industry's spokes people's claim to the contrary. The  
16 waste produced at these facilities poses tremendous  
17 human health and environmental risks for hundreds of  
18 thousands of years. What are needed to face our  
19 nation's energy needs in the future are not capital  
20 intensive projects that create the potential for  
21 gigantic environmental and human health risks, but  
22 rather, small scale efforts to increase energy  
23 efficiency in the use of sustainable energy resources.

24 While the former benefit the profit margins of large  
25 utility conglomerates, the latter benefit the energy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 and environmental needs of the people. Thank you.

2 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Next is Curtis  
3 Chick. Followed by Tim Herrmann.

4 CURTIS CHICK: Thank you for this  
5 opportunity to speak. My name is Curtis Chick. I'm a  
6 representative of the Sheet Metal Workers in Central  
7 Missouri and other building and construction trades  
8 unions across the State of Missouri. I worked at  
9 Callaway in the early 80's. Since then I've been in  
10 and out of the Callaway Number One helping at the  
11 various outages and refuels over the years. I've  
12 hunted and fished on the property over the years. I  
13 feel that the site is safe and I have witnessed the  
14 increases in safety since 911 that AmerenUE has  
15 implemented to make the plant more secure. In my  
16 opinion, and the opinion of a lot of the people I  
17 represent, we need more safe energy and we need jobs.  
18 People run around and talk about building fossil  
19 plants to burn clean coal. I've never worked at a  
20 clean coal site and I don't think I ever will; and  
21 with the new emissions tax that could be coming up,  
22 nuclear seems to be the fuel of choice for our future  
23 generations. I believe it is the cheapest and the  
24 cleanest and I concur with building Callaway Number  
25 Two. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Tim Herrmann  
2 followed by Mark Fohey.

3 TIM HERRMANN: Hello, my name is Tim  
4 Herrmann. I'm the Vice President of Engineering out  
5 at the Callaway Plant and I'm also in charge of the  
6 new unit. I wanted to just spend time to thank  
7 everyone who is here, both those who are here to  
8 support us and those that are here that have concerns.  
9 That's all part of the process. I wanted to make  
10 sure that we're here today, open to those, and that we  
11 take those in. That's part of what the NRC does. We  
12 have our Environmental Report that's in our COLA  
13 application. It speaks for itself. That's part of  
14 what the process is, and I thank everyone for being  
15 here today. Thank you.

16 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Mark Fohey  
17 followed by Kathleen Logan Smith.

18 MARK FOHEY: Thank you gentlemen. Thanks  
19 for letting me speak. I will be very brief. Curtis  
20 is good at stealing a lot of my stuff so. I went to  
21 Callaway in 1993 and I want to talk about a safe and  
22 clean environment for a working person. I, too,  
23 worked in almost every coal plant in Missouri. I'm  
24 for clean coal. Don't get me wrong. But the feeling  
25 you get -- once you go into that plant it's a leery

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 feeling, I'm sure of nuclear, but please anybody --  
2 you know -- go out there and see this plant. You will  
3 feel like you are right at home. I mean I did. And  
4 like I said, the jobs that they are creating -- I'm  
5 not going to go into the jobs, though. These jobs are  
6 good health care for your whole family, a good pension  
7 that you can retire with a good pension. And that's  
8 all I'll say. Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Kathleen Logan  
10 Smith followed by Kathleen Henry.

11 KATHLEEN LOGAN SMITH: It's the Irish  
12 hour for those of you paying attention. I am Kathleen  
13 Logan Smith, Executive Director with the Missouri  
14 Coalition For The Environment. I wanted to bring some  
15 environmental concerns to the EIS Scoping Session.  
16 Some of the issues that I wanted to see addressed in  
17 the EIS have to do with water and water impacts.  
18 Around the state we are having some issues with water  
19 availability and I know the Missouri River seems  
20 pretty permanent to most people; but I would like to  
21 see something -- in an extreme drought we could have  
22 conditions that might impact the quantity of water  
23 available. So water usage and water discharge, --  
24 thermal impacts. I'm concerned about thermal impacts  
25 to aquatic ecosystems in particular. I'm also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concerned about the impact of the massive construction  
2 project on the area surface waters, and whether there  
3 are plans to effectively mitigate sediment and runoff  
4 from that kind of activity. We are concerned about  
5 endangered species and aquatic life impacts, and macro  
6 invertebrates in addition to other organisms. Of  
7 particular interest is not just the storage of the  
8 spent fuel rods. We've got those stored in pools  
9 onsite. They are planning on dry cast storage above  
10 ground for the next hundred years or so. But they  
11 also have a problem right now with low level  
12 radioactive waste, and so where is that going to be  
13 dealt with onsite? In the hearing yesterday Tom Voss  
14 mentioned that they are looking for a place to dispose  
15 of that, but that's not happening right now. I think  
16 that the NRC needs to address where that will go and  
17 whether there is room onsite to safely store the so-  
18 called low level radioactive waste. My perspective on  
19 nuclear power is it is neither clean nor safe. And  
20 the most toxic impacts that I've seen are in uranium  
21 mining and in the production of the fuels and then we  
22 end up with waste onsite here. And the impacts from  
23 that may not be felt in my generation, but some  
24 generation is going to have to deal with those. And  
25 if -- I feel like we are leaving them a huge federal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 debt. A lot of families are leaving a lot of personal  
2 debt, and now we are leaving generations who have this  
3 idea that we might leave them radioactive waste debt.

4 And I'm not sure that we have equipped our children  
5 to pay bills of that magnitude.

6 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you.

7 Kathleen Henry followed by Henry Robertson.

8 KATHLEEN HENRY: My name is Kathleen  
9 Henry. I'm an attorney at Great Rivers Environmental  
10 Law Center, a non-profit environmental law firm in St.  
11 Louis. The following are some of the issues I would  
12 like the NRC to address before issuing an EIS. The  
13 first is whether there is an increased level of  
14 cancer, including breast cancer, of people who live  
15 within a thirty mile radius of the existing nuclear  
16 plant. A breast cancer survivor who lives near here  
17 tells me she believes there is an abnormally high  
18 number of cancer patients in the area. If the second  
19 reactor is built, this will only exacerbate the  
20 problem. The second is whether the Missouri River  
21 contains radioactive materials and what is that level  
22 exactly; and how far downstream do they travel before  
23 they become diluted if indeed they do become diluted?

24 I'm aware that Ameren learned of leaks of radioactive  
25 materials from Callaway One in the past two or three

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years; and Ameren had to purchase adjoining properties  
2 that were contaminated. The ground water in these  
3 properties contained radioactive materials. This  
4 tells me Ameren cannot contain the waste from one  
5 nuclear reactor. And to me that means allowing it to  
6 have two reactors will be worse. The contaminated  
7 ground waters from the purchased properties will  
8 travel and eventually make it to the Missouri River  
9 which is a source of drinking water for millions of  
10 people downstream from here. The third is what will  
11 be the cumulative impact of radiation from nuclear  
12 plants all over the world on human health. As you are  
13 aware, the NRC allows routine releases of radiation  
14 from each nuclear reactor. These routine releases are  
15 in the atmosphere and travel the globe. I'm asking  
16 the NRC to quantify the total amount of radiation  
17 released from existing and proposed nuclear plants all  
18 over the world before allowing Ameren to build a  
19 second reactor. Many of us believe cancer is an  
20 epidemic, and if the background level of radiation in  
21 the environment were not so high there would not be so  
22 many cancer cases. And fourth, I would like the NRC  
23 to consider what are the costs to the NRC, and whether  
24 they outweigh the benefits of the new plant. The NRC  
25 has its hands full regulating the one hundred and four

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 operating reactors. NRC Commissioner, Gregory Jaczko,  
2 stated last week and I quote,

3 "Almost sixty percent of the staff is new  
4 to the Agency. The Agency has received seventeen  
5 applications for twenty six new reactors over the last  
6 year and a half. But four of those seventeen have  
7 been put on hold by applicants. Because of this  
8 flurry of activity we now find ourselves making some  
9 of the same mistakes of the past. We have received  
10 seventeen applications before designs are complete and  
11 certified."

12 The cost benefit analysis should include the  
13 cost to the NRC staff, and consider the fact that if  
14 the staff spend the time reviewing new technologies  
15 and new plants, they can't spend their time regulating  
16 existing plants.

17 Has the staff been doubled so that it has  
18 time to do the extra work? The fact that AmerenUE had  
19 leaked some materials and was forced to buyout  
20 properties proves the NRC is not monitoring Callaway  
21 One adequately. The NRC must prove it can somehow  
22 monitor AmerenUE if Ameren has doubled the risks. And  
23 the fifth matter is concerning the socioeconomic  
24 chapters and our single review I would ask the NRC to  
25 conduct an economic analysis of alternatives.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           Excuse me. If the proposed plant will  
2       employ four thousand people during construction, NRC  
3       should look at how many people would be employed  
4       putting in energy efficiencies, wind power and solar  
5       power instead. There is no limit to the amount of  
6       retrofitting of existing buildings with energy  
7       efficiencies that could be done and that would employ  
8       people and would decrease our need for dirty power.  
9       Thank you.

10           FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you. Next  
11       is Henry Robertson followed by Jane Bruss.

12           HENRY ROBERTSON: Hello. I'm Henry  
13       Robertson. I'm Energy Chair of the Missouri Sierra  
14       Club. Among the issues I would like to be considered  
15       in the EIS are first the need for the project; and  
16       that means the need for power. I believe Ameren in  
17       their Environmental Report has overstated the  
18       prospects for growth in electricity demands, certainly  
19       well above the current projections of the Energy  
20       Information Administration and in excess of evidence  
21       that the electricity demand was starting to decline  
22       even before the economic downturn. Alternatives that  
23       should be kept for detailed consideration. First of  
24       all, energy efficiency states that pursued efficiency  
25       seriously have in some cases have begun to see their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 total electricity use decline, not just a rate of low  
2 growth but the total energy use. And Missouri has the  
3 highest potential for energy and efficiency in the  
4 midwest because we have not gotten that serious about  
5 it.

6 Another alternative to be considered is  
7 renewable energy. At the time that the COLA was  
8 filed, Missouri had no renewable energy standard but  
9 we have since adopted one which will require Ameren to  
10 get fifteen percent of its electricity from renewable  
11 sources by 2021, about the time Callaway Two would go  
12 online.

13 Another alternative is a combination of  
14 renewable energy and energy efficiency. This could  
15 cancel the need for the new plant and if I -- if we --  
16 I'm sure that there are more jobs possible in  
17 renewable energy and efficiency fields than could ever  
18 come from the construction, let along the operation,  
19 of Callaway Two. The cost benefit analysis, I believe  
20 Ameren has lowballed the overnight cost of this plant  
21 and levelized cost of energy and they have discounted  
22 decommissioning so far into the future that it appears  
23 to be irrelevant, but it is not. I ask you consider  
24 the cumulative effects of global warming, and that  
25 would include the demand for concrete and steel and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 aluminum. These construction materials are in heavy  
2 demand now for new power plants and infrastructure  
3 projects of all kinds and they are heavy contributors  
4 to global warming emissions. I would like you to  
5 consider the diversion of resources from what I  
6 consider the preferred alternatives of renewable  
7 energy and efficiency. These are cleaner and more  
8 benign, and the expense of nuclear power would crowd  
9 out investment in these more promising fields. I also  
10 ask you to consider the cumulative effects of the  
11 mining, processing and transportation of uranium; and  
12 also the overall uranium supply, and the effects on  
13 the environment of having to mine lower grade ores. I  
14 finally note that there is uranium prospecting going  
15 on right now in Mississippi County, Missouri using a  
16 process called in situ leaching. Although I don't  
17 know if that would provide a uranium source for  
18 Callaway Two, so I think the economic effects of that  
19 form of uranium mining should be considered. Thank  
20 you.

21 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Jane Bruss  
22 following by Kay Drey.

23 JANE BRUSS: Hello. Thank you everyone  
24 for being here this afternoon. I know it takes a lot  
25 out of all of us to take time out of our day. My name

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 is Jane Bruss. I'm from St. Louis. I worked on  
2 projects for Comonics World Bank, a U.S. agency for  
3 international development Deloitte, an Electric Power  
4 Research Institute, also known as EPRI. I have been  
5 to such far away places as the former Soviet blocked  
6 countries, Brazil, China and Alaska. I request that  
7 the NRC include analysis of the aging phenomenon of  
8 nuclear power plants in their EIS. Restated, how does  
9 aging affect the impacts of a nuclear power plant on  
10 the environment? It would be interesting and useful  
11 to read analysis of the fact that as a nuclear power  
12 plant gets older, the buildup of radioactive corrosion  
13 products, also known as CRUD, causes the piping and  
14 other pipes to become clogged and less efficient.  
15 Also as a part of the aging process the penetrating  
16 gamma particles of cobalt 60, and other isotopes in  
17 the CRUD, increase the radiation field in which  
18 employees have to work during the repair or  
19 replacement of corroded, or otherwise malfunctioning  
20 components. What are the current and proposed safety  
21 practices to protect employees from penetrating gamma  
22 particles considering that contaminated areas might  
23 not be immediately identifiable? And that is actually  
24 terminology used in the training manual for Callaway  
25 One. "Not immediately identifiable."

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           In the past the NRC has allowed chelating  
2 agents to be used to resolve the CRUD turning it into  
3 sludge or green grunge. This past practice raises a  
4 question in the present and for the future. Does the  
5 NRC still allow chelating agents or related chemicals  
6 or decontaminants to be used at nuclear power plants?

7       If so, does the NRC require its licensees to break  
8 down the chelating agents before the chelating  
9 radioactive wastes are allowed to be discharged into  
10 the environment? Are chelating agents allowed to be  
11 used during operation? What is the impact on chelate-  
12 based solvents on imbrittled or substandard metal  
13 parts? Because chelating agents stay bonded to the  
14 radioactive waste and therefore keep them in solution,  
15 does its presence accelerate the migration of the  
16 dissolved radioactive materials out of radioactive  
17 waste burial sites and into the environment? If the  
18 materials migrate, what will be the impact on the  
19 environment during the dry season or draught? If the  
20 NRC doesn't allow chelating agents, how does the  
21 licensee remove the CRUD since its presence does  
22 reduce the efficiency of the piping? Does the process  
23 occur more frequently if the solvent is weaker than  
24 chelated agents? How is the resulting effluent  
25 handled? Also in conjunction with a hearing that I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sat in on yesterday, Mr. Voss discussed, that would be  
2 Mr. Voss of AmerenUE, discussed that ninety percent of  
3 the waste is renewable. I'm not sure what he was  
4 referring to, what part of the waste is ninety  
5 percent. But, a thought occurred to me. Does that  
6 include waste from the potential reprocessing of fuel  
7 rods? Then, is that ninety percent of the acid wash  
8 that is used to reprocess fuel, is that considered  
9 ninety percent for the renewal? So, I thank you in  
10 advance for your thorough analysis of these concerns.

11 I know it is very difficult. I have been involved in  
12 several of these, many of these around the world.  
13 Thank you very much.

14 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you. We  
15 have Kay Drey -- okay, that's fine. Louis Green --  
16 Louise Green, followed by Dr. Reah Beck.

17 LOUISE GREEN: My name is Louise Green.  
18 I'm a member of the Missouri Coalition For The  
19 Environment. There is one question that the NRC  
20 should definitely include in its EIS, and that is,  
21 what should be done with the radioactive waste  
22 produced up at the nuclear plant? All nuclear plants  
23 produce two kinds of waste. One is high level waste  
24 which consists of the irradiated fuel rods which are  
25 removed from the reactor after fissioning so that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 six years. The second is low level waste which  
2 consists of saturated filters which have to be  
3 replaced when they are saturated. And residues and  
4 sludges which are saturated with radioactive  
5 contaminants from the gases and liquids which are  
6 released into the air. Low level wastes also include  
7 corroded pipes and pumps and equipment which have to  
8 be replaced. These are called low level waste, but  
9 actually they have to be handled by remote control  
10 equipment, otherwise the workers would receive a  
11 lethal dose of radiation. The problem is there may  
12 not be any site for these wastes. The Yucca Mountain  
13 site, which was supposed to accept our irradiated fuel  
14 rods, may never be built on a geologically unstable  
15 site which is prone to earthquakes. The site which  
16 was to accept low level waste, the Barnwell site in  
17 South Carolina, has refused to accept waste from forty  
18 six states including Missouri as of July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008.  
19 So the problem is, if there is no place that will  
20 accept these wastes, what will be the environmental  
21 impact of storing them on site for a hundred years, or  
22 two hundred years, or maybe even a thousand years or  
23 more? Thank you.

24 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you. Dr.  
25 Rhea Beck. Dr. Rhea Beck.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 DR. RHEA BECK: Kay Drey and I began  
2 working on trying to get a landfill of nuclear waste  
3 removed in Bridgeton, Missouri last summer. That has  
4 been like pulling a load of stones up a hill, a steep  
5 hill. We still haven't gotten anything done with it.

6 This is a really dangerous area which is leaking  
7 already into the Missouri River. I'm really concerned  
8 as a doctor that we don't know the cause of a lot of  
9 cancers. We do know that radiation causes cancer.  
10 There was a preliminary study that Callaway County has  
11 an increased incidence of cancer in this area since  
12 the plant has started. It's not conclusive. There is  
13 radiation going out every day from those smoke stacks  
14 that you see. There is radiation going into the  
15 Missouri River water. I'm really concerned that the  
16 wastes -- the wastes are going to be for millions of  
17 years. These things that have half lives are very  
18 long. We really need to be concerned, and to have  
19 another plant it's going to have more nuclear waste  
20 that's going to be stored on site. I saw this morning  
21 in the Post Dispatch where Italy wants to send its  
22 waste to Utah. Other countries don't know what to do  
23 with their wastes either. This seems to be a real big  
24 problem that needs to be dealt with before we really  
25 get into more nuclear energy.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you. Next  
2 is Pamela Murray followed by Barbara Jennings.

3 PAMELA MURRAY: My name is Pamela Murray  
4 and I am not a scientist and I hope you will all have  
5 some patience for the simplicity of my remarks and my  
6 conclusions. I am under the belief that a well-built,  
7 well-run power plant is inherently safer than one that  
8 is not. And that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
9 who regularly inspects Callaway One has a ton of  
10 regulations in place. I have been to Nuclear  
11 Regulatory Commission meetings where they have  
12 presented annual findings regarding safety at Callaway  
13 One, and come away with the feeling that everything is  
14 going well there; that the plant is well run; that  
15 when minor problems are found, they are immediately  
16 corrected. This in part, coupled with my experiences  
17 dealing with AmerenUE, lead me to support Callaway  
18 Two. As a resident and a customer of AmerenUE, I have  
19 found that they have a tremendous emphasis on safety.  
20 As a member of a civic group, I have found that  
21 Ameren has been very helpful and very supportive of  
22 community initiatives, and are an active partner in  
23 these things. As a member of a local government,  
24 Ameren has partnered with projects with our government  
25 saving valuable tax dollars that can be used in other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 ways. As a member of the Kingdom of Callaway Chamber  
2 of Commerce I am fully in support of the letter that  
3 was read by Nancy Lewis that was prepared by the Board  
4 of Directors of the Chamber. I'm somewhat intimidated  
5 by some of the scientific remarks; in particular, Mr.  
6 Haim's remarks. They are worthy of concern. But I'm  
7 also, as a non-scientist, confused by reading other  
8 things such as when other power plants are  
9 decommissioned. When you have coal plants there are  
10 sometimes heavy metal contamination of soil.  
11 Certainly any time a neighborhood gas station closes  
12 down you can see that there is environmental cleanup  
13 involved. So I think it's not just a question when  
14 looking at the environment of looking at nuclear power  
15 and nuclear byproducts and isolation, but also looking  
16 at other forms of energy at other plants and what  
17 their effect is on us. And with that, thank you.

18 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you.  
19 Barbara Jennings.

20 SISTER BARBARA JENNINGS: My name is  
21 Sister Barbara Jennings. I represent the eight  
22 investors in Ameren from the Midwest Coalition for  
23 Responsible Investments. We own stocks in Ameren and  
24 we are very concerned about the sustainability of this  
25 proposed nuclear plant. I will just briefly talk

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 about some of our concerns which are environmental  
2 concerns. First of all, a nuclear plant which will  
3 cost between six and eleven billion dollars and may  
4 never be completed is an outrageous offense to  
5 sustainable economics. Private banks; even before the  
6 fiscal crisis, said no loans. The Congress has said  
7 no loans. Ameren wants its customers to pay for this  
8 billions of dollars plant. My question is, why didn't  
9 Ameren ask the shareholders in 2008 to loan the money  
10 to AmerenUE? I have here Ameren's 2008 Integrated  
11 Resource Plan Report. Ameren only devoted one  
12 paragraph to Callaway Two. Not one word in this  
13 paragraph about costs or how this Callaway Two will be  
14 paid for. Elsewhere in the report, Ameren does list  
15 plans for gradual rate increases, unit retirements,  
16 and are very, -- have a hesitancy to ask customers to  
17 be more energy efficient. They also tout the Power on  
18 Program, which all of us in St. Louis benefitted from  
19 after those storms a few years ago. But not one word  
20 about the cost of Callaway Two or who is going to pay  
21 for it. Yet in the summer and the fall of 2008,  
22 Ameren courted Missouri legislators over the repeal of  
23 the CWIP Law to pay for this plant. I have heard, but  
24 I have not verified, that Ameren spent two hundred and  
25 fifty thousand dollars on this effort alone. We

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 shareholders have choices. We can withdraw our money  
2 from the company if we do not want to pay for Callaway  
3 Two. But rate payers cannot. We have no other  
4 electric company in our area except Kirkwood. We may  
5 need to sell our shares to pay our electric bills.  
6 Participants in this slide I noticed in the slide show  
7 that was presented also did not include shareholders  
8 as people who would make this decision. To Ameren's  
9 credit, Ameren has kept the rates down and been  
10 prudent in planning for gradual increases and for  
11 increases in demand. But rate increases of this  
12 magnitude would hurt those on fixed incomes, the  
13 disabled, the elderly and workers on minimum wage. Is  
14 Ameren willing to subsidize low income bill payers?  
15 The social sustainability of Callaway Two is tempting.  
16 Jobs in this area of Missouri are needed. Schools  
17 and infrastructures are needed. But might Ameren  
18 spend the money, the billions, on jobs for renewable  
19 energy, transmission systems and infrastructure.  
20 Finally, ecological sustainability is a concern of  
21 ours, and we want our company to be leaders in  
22 innovation, not laggards who look backwards to the  
23 structures of the 1979's and the 1980's for the answer  
24 to our energy needs. No new nuclear plant has been  
25 approved in this country since 1978. You have heard

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 already from many other people our ecological concerns  
2 in this room, so I will not dwell on that. We at the  
3 Midwest Coalition for Responsible Investments ask you  
4 not to allow this plan go further. Neither  
5 shareholders nor rate payers will benefit. Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR POSLOSNY: Thank you. Our  
7 last speaker who signed up is Raj Govindarajon. Okay.  
8 I don't have a taker for Raj.

9 Okay. That was the last person that  
10 signed up for scoping comments. With that, I would  
11 close the official record for the scoping comments for  
12 this plant; and suggest that the staff will be  
13 available in the back in the open house area to speak  
14 with you further. And thank you for coming this  
15 afternoon. Before that, I would like to -- our Senior  
16 Manager would like to say a few words if you can give  
17 me one minute. Thank you. Nilesh.

18 CLOSING

19 MR. CHOKSH: Thank you. My name is  
20 Nilesh Choksh. I am Deputy Director for the Division  
21 of Site and Environmental Reviews. I want to thank  
22 you for attending and taking time out from your busy  
23 schedule. I think that the scoping process is a very  
24 important element of the NRC fulfilling its  
25 responsibility of the NEPA and preparing the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Environmental Impact Statement. And getting the  
2 perspective and comments from the community which is  
3 going to be affected by if the plant is built, it's  
4 very important part of the process. I really thank  
5 you for coming and speaking to us.

6 I also want to further mention that as Dr.  
7 Olson mentioned, the comment period extends up to  
8 March 24<sup>th</sup>. You may register still there, so please,  
9 you know -- we would like to get as many comments as  
10 possible affecting our scoping process. Also on the  
11 NRC web site there are additional information  
12 available including the environmental information, the  
13 safety information, and also information on how to get  
14 involved in the licensing process. We will be back in  
15 about a year's time to discuss the draft EIS, and get  
16 further input and comments from you. Once again,  
17 thank you for coming.

18 (Meeting Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)